REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 17, 23, 24, 28, 33, 36, 39, and 44

have been amended to further move along the prosecution of this application. The

specification has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns with respect to

claims 2-4, and 13-15. Replacement drawings for Figures 1B, 2A, 4A and 4B are

attached hereto. The remainder of the Examiner's objections to the drawings have been

addressed by the amendments to the specification. No new matter has been introduced

by these amendments.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-15, 17-24, 26, 28-31, 33, 34, and 36-38 were rejected as being

unpatentable over the articles by Sloan et al. and Purcell et al. In light of the amendments

and the arguments contained herein, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration

of these rejections.

Independent claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 23, 28, 33, and 36 have been amended. More

specifically, claim 1 includes the feature of determining an approximation of a transfer

function component using at least one basis function, the approximation corresponding to

a center point of a texel associated with a corresponding point on the display object.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Sloan nor Purcell teach this feature. In fact

Purcell is restricted to the use of triangles (see Figures 2 and 4). Sloan mentions storing

the transfer functions in texture maps in section 6, however, the feature of claim 1, as

amended, is not taught in this section of Sloan. Claims 2-5 are dependent from claim 1

18

Amendment

Atty. Docket No. SONYP024

and therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Additionally, claim 5 has been

amended to include the feature of repeating the determining of an approximation of a

transfer function component for a series of basis functions without accessing a pre-

calculated geometry associated with the object. As stated in the application on page 25,

lines 1-4. Purcell requires that the scene geometry is stored as triangles within a data

structure (see page 705, section 3). Thus, Purcell requires that numerous tables and data

structures be generated for the stream processing. Furthermore, Purcell states that the

algorithm described herein may not be efficient for dynamic scenes, where the present

application is ideally suited for dynamic scenes as a result of being able to approximate

the transfer function and not having to calculate all the triangles required by Purcell.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not have

combined Sloan and Purcell as suggested by the Examiner as Purcell requires the data

structures and Purcell explicitly states that stream processing embodiments are not

efficient for dynamic scenes. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner elaborate

how one skilled in the art would disregard this teaching of Purcell and specify the

motivation to combine Sloan and Purcell.

Claim 12 includes the feature of program instructions for determining an

approximation of a transfer function component using at least one basis function, the

approximation corresponding to a center point of a texel associated with a corresponding

point on the display object. Claim 12 is patentable over the cited references for at least

the reasons stated above for claim 1. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 12 and are

likewise patentable over the cited references.

Amendment

Claims 6 and 17 include the feature of generating a ray from a point on the object

without accessing pre-calculated geometry associated with the object. As stated within

the present application, the preprocessing operations are eliminated and the calculations

are performed in real time without the need to access any pre-calculated geometry (see

figures 14 and 15 and corresponding text). As acknowledged by the Examiner, Sloan is

silent as to ray tracing. Purcell discusses ray tracing, however, Purcell requires the use of

pre-calculated geometries and pre-processed data structures as mentioned above.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 17, and dependent claims 7-11, and 18-22, respectively, are

patentable over the cited combination.

Claim 23 includes the feature of applying a ray tracing algorithm through a stream

processor without accessing pre-calculated geometry associated with the object. As

mentioned above with reference to claims 6 and 17, Purcell teaches away from this

feature by requiring that pre-calculated geometries be accessible and data structures for

the stream processing are built. Accordingly, claim 23, and dependent claims 24-27 are

patentable over the cited combination.

Applicants would like to further point out that claim 24 has been amended to

specify that the multiply and add operations are performed without the need to calculate

the lighting function at triangle corners. Purcell requires the calculation of the lighting

function at the triangle corners to be used with the stream processing (see section 3). As

acknowledged by the Examiner, Sloan does not teach the multiply and add operations.

Therefore, claim 24 includes additional features not taught or disclosed by Sloan or

Purcell.

Amendment

20

Atty. Docket No. SONYP024

Claims 28 and 36 have been amended to include the feature of calculating a

transfer function approximation of the lighting function through a stream processor, the

lighting function being sampled at a center of a texel. As mentioned above with regard to

claim 1, neither Sloan nor Purcell teach this feature. Accordingly, claims 28 and 36, and

dependent claims 29-32 and 37-38, respectively are patentable over the cited

combination.

Claim 33 includes the feature of program instruction for applying a ray tracing

algorithm through a stream processor without accessing pre-calculated geometry

associated with the object. As mentioned above with reference to claims 6 and 17,

Purcell teaches away from this feature by requiring that pre-calculated geometries be

accessible and data structures for the stream processing are built. Accordingly, claim 33,

and dependent claims 34-35 are patentable over the cited combination.

Claim 39 was rejected as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,639,595 to

Drebin et al., in view of Sloan and further in view of Purcell. Claim 39 includes the

feature of a graphics processing unit (GPU) capable of determining lighting

characteristics for an object in real time without accessing pre-calculated geometry

associated with the object. As discussed above with reference to claims 6 and 17, Purcell

teaches away from this feature by requiring that pre-calculated geometries be accessible

and data structures for the stream processing are built. Drebin and Sloan do nothing to

cure this deficiency. Drebin also utilizes triangle calculations (see Figures 12-20).

Accordingly, claim 39, and dependent claims 40-46 are patentable over the cited

combination. Claim 44 has also been amended to specify that the ray tracing algorithm

determines a direct illumination lighting characteristic in real time for multiple points on

21

Amendment

Atty. Docket No. SONYP024

Application No. 10/645,819

10/645,819

Office action response dated December 21, 2005

Responsive to Office Action Dated August 25, 2005

the object and the multiply and add operation determine a secondary lighting

characteristic in real time without calculating the lighting function at triangle corners. As

mentioned above, Purcell teaches using the pre-calculated triangle geometry with the

stream processing for non-dynamic scenes.

Applicants would like to further point out that the additionally cited references,

namely, Cook, Bonello, and Moller, do not cure the above specified deficiencies of the

combination of Sloan and Purcell, with or without Drebin.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending

claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In

the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the

Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 774-6921. If any fees are due in

connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge

such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SONYP024). A copy of the

transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

Michael L. Gencarella

Registration No. 44,703

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200 Sunnyvale, California 94085

Telephone: (408) 749-6900

Customer No. 25920